

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 4, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action.

Claims 1-24 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-13 and 16-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,723 to O'Toole (O'Toole). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-12 depend, recites a method for real time addition of statistics definitions and for achieving real-time reporting in a telephone switching system. The method comprises a database containing information of essential importance to the telephone switching system, a database manager, whose function is to maintain the database, and one or more service providers. The method comprises receiving by means of the database manager, a registration of the service provider. The method further comprises having the database manager send the service provider an inquiry asking for information about services produced by it. The method further comprises storing service definition data supplied by the service provider in the data base and generating a new definitions file for reporting purposes on the basis of the service definition data in the database.

Claim 13, from which claims 13-24 depend, recites a system for real-time addition of statistics definitions and for achieving real-time reporting in a telephone

switching system. The system comprises a database containing information of essential importance to the telephone switching system, a database manager whose function is to maintain the database, and one or more service providers. The system comprises means for receiving a registration of a service provider by means of the database manager. The system further comprises means for requesting information about services produced by the service provider using the database manager. Further, the system comprises means for storing service definition data supplied by the service provider in a database and means for generating a new definitions file for reporting purposes on the basis of the service definition data in the database.

The present invention provides real-time information about a telephone switching system. A service provider (SER) sends information on telephone exchange functions to a database manager (MGER). The database manager stores the information on the functions in a definitions file. The generation of definitions files is done automatically. The definitions file refers to a file that includes what kind of data and from where the data is collected. In addition, it includes a report form of the telephone switching center information.

O'Toole discloses methods and apparatus for remote configuration of an appliance on a network. O'Toole discloses a network appliance that is capable of remote booting and is capable of obtaining its configuration information from a remote source. A network appliance can be shipped to a business location or an office environment without requiring a local boot server in that location or environment and without requiring the presence of a person who is familiar and highly skilled in

configuring the appliance (see Abstract). The network appliance, such as a product that can be sold by a company interested in providing media content to the user, is connected to a local area network (LAN). The appliance configures itself by running a booting algorithm, which it gets from an appliance registry. (See column 6, lines 38-46.) The booting algorithm is sent as a response to a booting status message sent from the appliance to the appliance registry. The appliance registry has an attached database, which has information on, for example, the brief status table or with a configuration table in it. The goal of the boot algorithm is to learn enough about the IP environment in which the appliance is installed to obtain a connection with an appliance registry in order to download additional configuration information. (See column 6 lines 50-55).

It is respectfully submitted that O'Toole fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1-24. The Office Action maintains that the appliance and appliance registry disclosed in O'Toole are analogous to the service provider and database manager recited in claims 1-24. Specifically, the Office Action states that the “correlation in O'Toole between the appliance (18) and a service provider is correct since the appliance (18) services the LAN.” It is not clear how and appliance services the LAN in O'Toole. Instead, O'Toole discloses that the appliance uses the LAN to boot and select a set of network parameters. O'Toole appears to be void of any discussion of the appliance servicing the LAN, as alleged in the Office Action. Thus, the appliance disclosed in O'Toole is not analogous to the service provider recited in the pending claims.

As discussed above, O'Toole discloses that the appliance sends a boot status message to the appliance registry to receive configuration information from the appliance registry. The goal of the boot algorithm is to learn enough about the IP environment in which the appliance is installed to obtain a connection with an appliance registry in order to download additional configuration information. Specifically, the appliance disclosed in O'Toole merely receives configuration information in order to communicate over the Internet. It is therefore, not a registration of a service provider as recited in claim 1 and similarly claim 13.

The Office Action maintains that O'Toole discloses that the appliance registry (alleged database manager) sends an inquiry to the appliance (alleged service provider).

As discussed in the Response filed on January 26, 2005, the appliance registry sends configuration information to a router and not the appliance in step 116 of Figure 4. Thus, O'Toole fails to disclose or suggest the feature that the registry sends an inquiry to a service provider, as recited in claims 1 and 13.

Further, the configuration information sent from the tables in the appliance registry as disclosed in O'Toole, is not analogous to an inquiry. The Office Action alleges that O'Toole discloses the inquiry feature, at Figure 4 step 116. This is clearly not the case. First, in O'Toole, the message in step 116 is not transmitted directly to the appliance, but to a router. See column 10 lines 9-15. The router then sends out an ARP message because it does not know the correct Internet address of the appliance.

Second, O'Toole does not disclose or suggest that the database manager sends an inquiry requesting information on the service provider services, as recited in claim 1 and

similarly recited in claim 13. As discussed above, O'Toole discloses that the appliance (18) runs a booting algorithm to retrieve information on the IP environment to form a connection with the appliance registry. Thus, O'Toole merely discloses an appliance (alleged service provider) sending a request to obtain the configuration data that it needs in order to configure itself. Thus, the appliance register (alleged database manager) does not send any inquiry to the new appliance (alleged service provider) and the new appliance does not send information on its services, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 13. The Office Action asserts that the appliance register send an inquiry, at step 116, because "it is followed by a reply."

As recited in claims 1 and 13, service definition data is supplied by the service provider in response the inquiry, and stored. In contrast, the "reply" disclosed in O'Toole is step 120 wherein the appliance responds with its Ethernet address. Thus, service definition data is not received and stored in O'Toole as recited in claims 1 and 13 because an Ethernet address is not analogous to feature of service definition data, as recited in the pending claims.

It is respectfully submitted that since claim 4-12 and 16-24 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, that these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-13 and 16-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 2, 3, 14, and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, it is respectfully

submitted that these claims are allowable in their present form, at least for the reasons discussed above.

It is further submitted that each of claims 1-24 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-24 be allowed and this application pass to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Brown
Registration No. 51,091

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:mm